

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
OCALA DIVISION**

WILLIAM L. GREEN and
MYA R. GREEN,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Case No. 5:23-cv-62-MMH-PRL

UNITED STATES DEPT. OF
JUSTICE OPR, et al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Stay (Dkt. No. 20; Motion) filed on July 17, 2023. In the Motion, Defendants request that the Court stay this case, including the obligation to file a case management report and to conduct discovery, until the Court rules on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 13). See generally Motion. Plaintiffs oppose the relief requested in the Motion. See Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Stay (Dkt. No. 22; Response).

District courts are vested with broad discretion to stay proceedings. Gibson v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., No. 6:21-cv-810-GKS-LRH, 2021 WL 5926348, at *1 (M.D. Fla. July 14, 2021) (staying entire case because of a backlog caused by

COVID-19); Murdock v. Santander Consumer USA Inc., No. 2:15-cv-268-SPC-CM, 2016 WL 3913135, at *2 (M.D. Fla. July 20, 2016) (finding that “a stay of the entire case will promote judicial economy and efficiency”). Pursuant to their authority, district courts may stay proceedings as a means of managing their dockets. Lewis v. Abbott Labs., Inc., No. 6:19-cv-909-GAP-LHP, 2019 WL 5448289, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 2, 2019); see also Dietz v. Bouldin, 579 U.S. 40, 47 (2016) (“[D]istrict courts have the inherent authority to manage their dockets and courtrooms with a view toward the efficient and expedient resolution of cases.”). Additionally, in appropriate circumstances, courts may enter a stay to promote judicial economy, reduce confusion and prejudice, and prevent possibly inconsistent resolutions. Terec v. Reg’l Acceptance Corp., No. 8:16-cv-2615-JSM-MAP, 2017 WL 662181, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 17, 2017) (citing Rodriguez v. DFS Servs., LLC, No. 8:15-cv-2601-JSM-TBM, 2016 WL 369052, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 1, 2016)). So long as the scope of a stay is limited and a reasonable justification is provided, courts do not abuse their discretion by granting a stay. Trujillo v. Conover & Co. Commc’ns, Inc., 221 F.3d 1262, 1264 (11th Cir. 2000).

Upon review, the Court finds it appropriate to stay discovery in this case pending a ruling on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED:

1. Defendants’ Motion to Stay (Dkt. No. 20) is **GRANTED**.

2. Discovery is **STAYED**, and the parties are relieved of their obligation to file a case management report.
3. The parties shall file a Joint Uniform Case Management Report¹ within **TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS** of this Court's ruling on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers this 25th day of July, 2023.


MARCIA MORALES HOWARD
United States District Judge

ja

Copies to:

Counsel of Record
Pro Se Parties

¹ The uniform Case Management Report form is available on this Court's website at www.flmd.uscourts.gov.